

10

NGC-162/000388-280

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 13 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-15 are pending. Claims 1-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b)

Claims 1-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Nouredin et al., "Computer Modelling of Microelectronic Closed Loop Fiber Optic Gyroscope", 1999 IEEE, May 9-12, 1999.

Applicant has avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claim 1, as amended, now recites,

"computing, via digital signal processing, one or more performance parameters of a fiber optic gyroscope to determine a relationship between a performance parameter and a physical parameter associated with fiber optic gyroscope components through employment of a closed-loop transfer function based on at least one characteristic of:

one or more optical components of the fiber optic gyroscope; and

one or more electrical components of the fiber optic gyroscope;

wherein the closed-loop transfer function has a frequency response of at least 1400 Hz."

Nouredin does not teach this limitation. Instead, Nouredin discloses a FOG modeled as a first order system with a time constant of 50 seconds and above, as shown in FIG. 2. By contrast, applicant's claim 1 recites, "wherein the closed-loop transfer function has a frequency response of at least 1400 Hz." See FIGs, on page 23 of applicant's specification. The frequency response of at least 1400 Hz translates into a step response of a very small fraction of a second. Thus, Nouredin is missing "the closed-loop transfer function has a frequency response of at least 1400 Hz, as recited in applicant's claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that Nouredin does not describe each and every element of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by Nouredin.

Since claims 2-10 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over Nouredin.


Independent claim 11 has a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by Nouredin. For example, claim 11 recites, "wherein the closed-loop transfer function has a frequency response of at least 1400 Hz". Nouredin does not teach this limitation for the above-mentioned reasons. Therefore, claim 11 is likewise allowable over Nouredin. Since claims 12 and 14-15 depend from claim 11, these dependent claims are also allowable over Nouredin.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Carmen B. Patti
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 26,784

Dated: June 13, 2007

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 32205